

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NICOLE DENISE REED,
Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF ROCKLIN, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:24-cv-02152-DJC-SCR

ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiff's second stipulation and proposed order for protective order. ECF No. 24. The proposed order is before the undersigned pursuant to Local Rule 302(c)(1). The parties previously submitted a stipulation and proposed order on January 7, 2025. ECF No. 22. The Court entered an order informing the parties that the proposal was overbroad. The proposed order purported to protect all "Discovery Material," and that term was defined in an overbroad manner. ECF No. 22 at ¶ 2.2. The order informed the parties that they could submit a revised stipulation that complies with the requirements of Local Rule 141.1(c).

Local Rule 141.1(c) sets forth the requirements for a proposed protective order. Every proposed protective order "shall contain": 1) a description of the types of information eligible for protection under the order; 2) a showing of particularized need for protection as to each category of information proposed to be covered by the order; and 3) a showing as to why the need for protection should be addressed by a court order, as opposed to a private agreement among the

1 parties. The parties' second proposed protective order (ECF No. 24) has removed the definition
2 of "Discovery Material" from paragraph 2.2 and replaced it with "Confidential." However, the
3 proposed order then continues to refer to the term "Discovery Material" throughout. For
4 example, paragraph 3 provides the scope of the order is to cover "all Discovery Material
5 disclosed during the course of this litigation." ECF No. 24 at ¶ 3. The proposed order refers to
6 "Discovery Material" seven times, even though it is no longer a defined term in the proposed
7 protective order. The second proposed order also does not address all the requirements of Local
8 Rule 141.1(c). The first two paragraphs do provide a brief description of the types of information
9 the order seeks to protect; however, the proposed order does not address the "particularized need
10 for protection as to each category of information" or why the need for protection should be
11 addressed by court order, rather than private agreement.

12 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:** The Court declines to enter the proposed protective order
13 for the reasons set forth herein. The parties may submit a revised stipulation and proposed
14 protective order that addresses the Court's concerns and complies with Local Rule 141.1(c).
15 SO ORDERED.

16 DATED: January 27, 2025

17
18 
19 SEAN C. RIORDAN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE